

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /AE/DuPont

01/31/2012 10:45 PM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) CL/DuPont

cc

bcc

Subject Re: 5S Status

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

On Thursday, 1/26/12, at the forward energy meeting, we were all asked to say in one word how we feel.

My answer was that i was worried. I am worried and concerned; because the last 2 dupont burnside employees terminated were young african americans. We still are unaware of the reason of the dismissal of a 17 year veteran, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6). No one wants to lose their jobs. I am just worried that someone here tries to get me terminated next; because of the pass history that i have went through with the pass management. You said for us to let you know our concerns. This is my most serious concern, because just like every other employee, i have a family to take care of.

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

My email
to

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

(b) (7) (C), (b) (7) (C), (b) (6)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
(b) (7)(C), HO/DuPont
02/13/2012 04:00 AM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C), AE/DuPont, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) AE/DuPont
cc
bcc
Subject Important Documentation

Just thought I should send an email to someone in DuPont that I can trust, informing you of what transpired on Feb. 1, 2012 at night when we were working outside job number one. (b) (7) and (b) (7) had stayed over working on a SO3 leak on the CIP exchanger. Evidently they left without being able to completely mitigate the leak. When myself and (b) (7) were moving cars in the back of the plant, (b) (7)(C) noticed we had a pretty substantial amount of SO3 coming from, what appeared to be the converter area. I noted that this gas was in fact making its way past the fence line. I immediately notified the other two guys that we needed to investigate the leak more closely. (b) (7) agreed to do so. One half hour later when I was finished moving cars I called to check what had been found only (b) (7) had not gone yet. though (b) (7) agreed to meet with me and look at the leak presently.. Upon investigation we noticed that the leak was, in fact, coming from the initial leak on the CIP exchanger. I told (b) (7) we will need to do something about this. It was bad enough. I tried to pull additional vacuum by the SO3 T/c spot but it didn't help. So I wrote an email to (b) (7) my supervisor, letting (b) (7) know we attempted to do something about the leak but it was still pretty bad. (b) (7) called back with in about 30 minutes and asked what could be done and indicated that (b) (7) would like me to call (b) (7) which I thought by emailing (b) (7) (b) (7) would get the message more readily since it had been working for us better in the past. I told (b) (7) then that the only thing we could do is cut rates and slow the blower down or shut down completely. (b) (7) agreed to cut some rates but only one gun of spent at a time.

So I made plans with the board man to do just that but (b) (7) said we weren't going to do that. I said why not and they said cause (b) (7)(C) was on sight and didn't want to. I came back to the control room where (b) (7) was visibly angry and asked that I go into the stores alone with (b) (7). In stores (b) (7) preceded to yell at me and tell me that (b) (7) was tired of this that (b) (7) felt I was trying to build a case for myself that if I wanted to play games (b) (7) would play and said "we will see who will last longer" If I sent (b) (7) another email or (b) (7) about leaks or environmental releases I would be in big trouble. (b) (7) said do you understand that when you send that in email it is a legal document. I said I was just doing my job as outlined by TOSCA requirements which state we must report environmental releases to our plant supervision. (b) (7) said you are not doing your job (b) (7) said you should not write anything down you should call. I said the only way I can get (b) (7) to call me back is to write (b) (7) an email everytime I have called (b) (7) in the past (b) (7) has never returned my call. (b) (7) said (b) (7) was going to talk to (b) (7) and see if that is still the case. I said let me get this straight though you are saying if I email you and let you know about an environmental offsite release that I will get in trouble. (b) (7) said yes. I asked (b) (7) three times to go with me in the back and see the extent of the release to which (b) (7) refused and once in front of (b) (7) and (b) (7). I said how can you tell how severe it is then and (b) (7) said (b) (7) was the plant manager and that (b) (7) was telling me it was not going off sight and that was that. I said okay that is all I needed to know and next time I would call as well as write. I later apologized for getting "toud with (b) (7) and (b) (7) apologized as well.

My question to you guys is given the gravity of the events that have happened to all of us at this site in the recent past and the current situation that we still feel threatened by management in lue of the plant manager personell change from (b) (7) to (b) (7) do you guys feel I we should let corporate HR know about these continued violations of civil rights. I have continually been harassed for only doing my job. (b) (7)(C) has now been released for turning in a safety violation and Leo has repeatedly been harassed by people's increased servalence? They have also continued to cut me out of plant functions which were previously held by me such as (b) (7) Committee, LOCK Tag and TRY implementation and DPS involvement.

(b) (7)

Spoke to our process
engineer (a friend of mine)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

A large black rectangular redaction box covers several lines of text in the document.

who informed me
the reason the plant manager's
are very reluctant to report
offsite releases is because it is
a \$25,000 fine per day, which
gives them a bad record.

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /AE/DuPont

02/14/2012 01:03 PM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) HO/DuPont@DuPont

cc

bcc


Subject Re: Important Documentation 

(b) (7)

I RECIEVED YOUR EMAIL.I MYSELF AM STILL WORRIED ABOUT MY JOB;BEING AN AFRICAN AMERICAN. HR WAS CALLED IN LAST TIME WE HAD THIS PROBLEM. I CANNOT SAY IT WOULD BE A BAD IDEA;IF YOU TALK TO HR. JUST MAKE SURE IT IS DONE IN THE PROPER ORDER.

(b) (7)

(b) (7)(C), /AE/DuPont
02/14/2012 04:47 PM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) HO/DuPont@DuPont
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Important Documentation 

Yes I do. I feel like any mistake that you may make could be your last. I also feel like the magnified glass is zooming in more closer and more particular. I know that I want things to turn around for the positive and I am holding out for hope. I don't feel any since of teamwork at all. We don't need to experience anything near the levels as before.



(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont
03/02/2012 12:41 PM

To: (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) AE/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C),
(b) (7)(C), /HO/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C),
(b) (7)(C), /HO/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C),
bcc:
Subject: Re: FORWARD ENERGY -- 3/2/2012

I am curious about the comment on leaks...If the person who wrote it would come see me I would appreciate it...Thanks...

Best Regards,

(b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C)
Burnside Plant
DUCOM 642-5981
Phone: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
Cell: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

DuPont Chemicals & Fluoroproducts

Notes: [redacted]

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) 03/02/2012 10:15:27 AM--Folks, The energy score for this week was .55 -- our flag remain...

From: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
To:

Cc:
Date: 03/02/2012 10:15 AM
Subject: FORWARD ENERGY -- 3/2/2012

Folks,

The energy score for this week was .55 -- our flag remains GREEN -- good interaction at the meeting -- written comments received were positive and constructive. Internal and External distractions are trending down.

[attachment "ForwardEnergyWeek 2012.3.2.doc" deleted by (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)]



(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont

03/13/2012 08:42 AM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Border - MitC-II: Issued, L1 Convertor Gas Leaks

----- Forwarded by (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont on 03/13/2012 08:42 AM -----

From: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /HO/DuPont
To: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /AE/DuPont@DuPont
Cc: SPEC~Sulfur~Borderland~Authors@, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /AE/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /AE/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /AE/DuPont@DuPont
Date: 03/13/2012 08:39 AM
Subject: Border - MitC-II: Issued, L1 Convertor Gas Leaks

Title: L1 Convertor Gas Leaks

Incident Date: 3/2/2012

Incident Time: 10:30:00 AM

Business/Unit: Borderland

Area: Acid Plant

Brief Description: An E/I technician working in the area noticed 'some smoke' coming from the damper valve from the Hot Air HX to the 2nd pass and informed Operations. Then, the E/I technician and one operator climbed the scaffold to assess the leak and confirmed it was SO3 forming acid mist with the humidity in the air. But they also noticed a strong smell of SO2 coming from the east side of the recuperator. Immediately thereafter, they started looking for places where the SO2 smell was coming from. After a careful review of the area, it was determined that it was coming from the inlet duct damper to the 1st pass.

Immediate Action: The 1st pass inlet damper leak was fixed by replacing the valve packing. The leak from the 2nd pass inlet damper valve was fixed by plugging the grease fitting where the gas was coming from.

Type of Incident: Environmental

Was there Potential for an On -Job Injury / illness: No

Was there an On -Job Injury / Illness: No





(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont

03/20/2012 01:44 PM

To: (b) (7)(C), (b) AE/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)
(b) (7)(C), AE/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C),
(b) (6) P

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: Burn: MitC-II: Approve Rating, Railcar Derail

----- Forwarded by (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont on 03/20/2012 01:44 PM -----

From: (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont
To: (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont@DuPont
Date: 03/20/2012 01:36 PM
Subject: Burn: MitC-II: Approve Rating, Railcar Derail

Title: Railcar Derail

Incident Date: 3/20/2012

Incident Time: 12:15:00 PM

Business/Unit: Burnside

Area: Acid Plant

Brief Description: CN was attempting to deliver cars to the site when two railcars (one SO3 and one fresh car) derailed damaging security fence..

Immediate Action: (1) Arranged for security to be present until fence is repaired and (2) Notified CN

Type of Incident: Workplace Safety

Was there Potential for an On -Job Injury / illness: No

Was there an On-Job Injury / Illness: No





(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont

03/29/2012 09:02 AM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) AE/DuPont@DuPont (b) (7)
(b) (7)(C), AE/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7) L
(b) (7)(C), /HO/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C), (b)

cc

bcc

Subject Fw: ISO14001 EMR Appointment

This notice serves as a re -communication of the appointment of (b) (7)(C), (b) as Environmental Management Representative (EMR) for the Burnside Plant . The initial communication was done in the fall of 2008 by (b) (7)(C), (b) , Plant Manager .



(b) (7) (b) (7)/CL/DuPont

03/29/2012 12:59 PM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /Contractor/AE/DuPont@DuPont

cc (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /AP/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7) (b) (7)(C), AE/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C),

(b) (7)(C), /HO/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Subject Re: First Reports

All,

Seven incidents in a little over a week is way above normal.

Fortunately, we have been able to maintain the first item in the Top 5 - Protect Yourself, Your Coworkers and The Environment.

Remember, maintaining excellent safety performance requires constant vigilance to the states which prevent critical errors.

Thanks for your help in keeping Burnside a safe place to work.

Best Regards,

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Burnside Plant

DUCOM (b) (7)(C),

Phone: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

DuPont Chemicals & Fluoroproducts

Latasha Geason




(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) ---03/29/2012 12:48:46 PM (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) Dupont Chemical Solutions Enterprises





From: Latasha Geason/Contractor/AE/DuPont

To: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Date: 03/29/2012 12:48 PM

Subject: First Reports

 Entergy
voltage drop 3.23.2012.doc
 CIP gas leak loading
3.18.2012.doc
 SO3 in
control
panel at
loading.doc

 Burnside First Report -Elec. Junction Box.doc
 Railcar
cap not
in
place.doc
 Cip Gas
Leak
3.19.2012.doc
 Derail
at 5,7
crack.doc

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

*Dupont Chemical Solutions Enterprises
Burnside Plant*

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) Tel

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) fax

(b) (7)(C), (Ducom)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) @usa.dupont.com



(b) (7)(C), M
(b) (7)(C), AE/DuPont
04/04/2012 10:03 AM

To Jeffrey M (b) (7)(C), (b) HO/DuPont@DuPont
cc (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont@DuPont
bcc
Subject MyInfo- Sick time

History: This message has been replied to.

(b)

While on shift log into myinfo and input your sick time for 1/28 and 2/7. I will follow-up next week in myinfo.

If you have questions let me know.

Regards,

(b) (7)(C),

(b) (7)(C),
(b) (7)(C), (b) HO/DuPont
04/06/2012 05:37 PM

To (b) (7)(C), M (b) (7)(C), AE/DuPont
cc
bcc
Subject Re: MyInfo- Sick time

(b)

I am thinking I only missed one day in 2012 which was on 1/28 for severe pains in the back of my head and neck area which I thought was migrains but my doctor, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) said it was more likely to have been a pulled muscle in my neck from the railcars I had done the day(s) before. On 2/7/2012 you guys sent me to medical after (b) (7) warned me to be careful because this could result in a loss work day case for the plant. I told (b) (7) that I would tell the truth in any case. When I spoke to doctor (b) (7) (b) suggested that in fact the diagnosis was correct and asked (b) (7) why I was being sent there to confirm and I expressed to (b) that I think they are concerned about a LWD and (b) said it could very well have been just a tension headache and that is how it was written up. But I was back at work later that day. I did not miss work on 2/7/2012, to my knowledge.

Thanks,

(b)



First Reports

(b) (7)(C), (b) (7) to: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

04/11/2012 09:17 AM

Cc: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

As a reminder, attached is the first report process we have to use to log (b) incidents. Documentation of (b) incidents in other forms is unacceptable. A binder with blank copies, completed reports and a copy of the process is in the control room.



First Report Process Map.ppt

Please see me with questions.

Thanks!

Best Regards,

(b) (7)(C), (b)

Burnside Plant

DUCOM (b) (7)(C),

Phone: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

DuPont Chemicals & Fluoroproducts

Value Engineering



(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont
04/16/2012 01:23 PM

To: (b) (7)(C), (b) AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
bcc:
Subject: Re: FORWARD ENERGY -- 4/12/2012

I am very disappointed that many assumptions have led to low energy and potential distractions.
If anybody feels that (b) (b) cannot work safely due to being in an improper state of mind, please see me.

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) 04/13/2012 03:08:21 PM--Folks, The energy score is up and all categories were up this we...

From: (b) (7)(C), (b) AE/DuPont
To: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Date: 04/13/2012 03:08 PM
Subject: FORWARD ENERGY -- 4/12/2012

Folks,

The energy score is up and all categories were up this week except (b) (7) Behavior.

[attachment "ForwardEnergyWeek 2012.4.12.doc" deleted by (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) CL/DuPont]

What are we doing right that we should continue to focus our energy on ?

- Safety
- Good job sucking up all leaks so they don't get off site anymore, focus on making acid for customers
- Five Zeros
- Management's open door policy is working well

What issues/problems exist that are preventing us from continuous improvement?

- Absolutely no ethics in DuPont management any more
- Need to continue to focus on job tasks and not items that do not involve us directly
- Questionable hiring practices continue to be the main churn
- Management needs to have continuity in the hiring process and have more control or openness of what is going on at the facility
- Continuity between management and employees
- Market is slow
- Ops personnel are getting in an uproar about recent hiring process. Gonna be a #\$\$%-storm again if management doesn't head it off before it starts -- don't want all this to happen again...
- People should make a conscious decision to come to work with a positive attitude

CONTINUITY -- PRACTICE SAFE

START

ERROR REDUCTION TECHNIQUES

Attached is the survey form. If you are not available to participate in the survey typically done at Thursday morning meetings -- simply print the form, fill it out, and drop it in Meta's mail box in the Admin Bldg. box or before the next scheduled meeting

[attachment "FORWARD ENERGY ASSESSMENT CATEGORIES REVISED.doc" deleted by (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) CL/DuPont]

Regards,

(b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C)

DuPont Burnside


DUCOM: (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C)

External: (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) @usa.dupont.com

You're either part of the solution, or you're part of the problem -- Eldridge Cleaver

Jeffrey M
(b) (7)(C), (b) HO/DuPont
04/16/2012 05:19 PM

To (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont@DuPont
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Communication 

(b) (7)

(b) is well aware of the concerns I have and I am sure you has shared them with you.

(b)

(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont
04/16/2012 06:43 PM

To: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)) HO/DuPont@DuPont
cc
bcc
Subject: Re: Communication

I would like to speak with you regarding your concern. Please advise of a good time.

Thanks

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

----- Original Message -----


From: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
Sent: 04/16/2012 05:19 PM CDT
To: (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C),
Subject: Re: Communication

(b) (7)

(b) is well aware of the concerns I have and I am sure you has shared them with you.

(b)

Jeffrey M
(b) (7)(C), (b) HO/DuPont
04/17/2012 05:37 PM

To (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont@DuPont
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Communication 

(b) (7)

You should know that I am currently being advised by my two attorney's, J. (b) (7)(C), (b) and (b) (7)(C), (b) not to speak, anymore, to anyone, regarding this matter. I have given DuPont chance after chance, for three years now, to stop retaliating against me and DuPont has chosen not to. If you need to speak to me I can only advise you or Ms. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) to contact (b) (7) at 225-235-9016. I am certain (b) (7) will be able to work you into (b) (7) schedule. I will be glad to speak to you anytime you want about any other DuPont matter, however.

Respectfully,

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)



(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont

04/25/2012 09:54 AM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C), (b) HO/DuPont@DuPont

cc

bcc

Subject Response

(b) (7)

I have attempted to meet with you to discuss the details of your concerns regarding the shipping clerk selection process on a couple occasions over the last two weeks. You have confirmed for me that you are not interested in having a conversation with me about those concerns. I can only assume that there are no additional details you wish to provide. Based on the information available, I have concluded that our testing processes were conducted fairly and in accordance with our policies and procedures. The bottom line is that you did not pass the qualification test and therefore are not eligible to be considered for the job. As you have nothing else to offer, I now consider the matter closed.

I would also like to remind you that while you are free to raise concerns and issues you MUST do so in a respectful and appropriate manner. Disruptive and disrespectful conduct will not be tolerated.

Best Regards,

(b) (7)(C), (b) (7)

Burnside Plant

DUCOM (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)

Phone: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

DuPont Chemicals & Fluoroproducts

See below

(b) (7)(C),
(b) (7)(C), (b) HO/DuPont
04/25/2012 05:41 PM

To (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont@DuPont
cc (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /CL/DuPont@DuPont
bcc
Subject Re: Response to your response

(b) (7)

Thankyou for your statement and if you deem it is closed internally within the confines of DuPont I will be forced to concur though I still would argue that I should not be expected to share the details of what I deem to be irregular practice of DuPont Burnside plant policy with individuals who may very well be the ones not following the correct practice to begin with. I.E. you were video taped in (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) office when I arrived for the test and back in (b) office only seconds after I completed the test. (b) (7)(C), (b) tried to sabotage me during the test by telling me it was a timed test and I have shared other evidence with Corp. HR that will come to light when needed. Since, this is the first time in the history of the plant that a test was given to any employee for any job since you have been here and before and the test was on software that doesn't exist on our plant I can only assume this was a very personal and retaliatory act. Their are people on this site that have shared with me conversations regarding the planned outcome of the entire hiring process. (b) (7) should now that there is ample written evidence to support my claims all (b) has to do is research. As I stated before my attorney says that I have with stood enough non-sense that if you guys would like to speak to me anymore you can speak to me with (b) present.

If at any time I have shown anyone on this plant disrespect I would expect that you would have shared that with me. I however, have been disrespected over and over again during the course of the past three years. Firstly, for coming forward on behalf of my two co-workers for alleged discrimination. I was sent home and threatened to be fired. I was systematically harassed for almost a year until I had to take two months off from the stress and you yourself came all the way to the plant to harass me when I reported an SO3 leak to my supervisor, as per Tosca regulations in conjunction with our Title V permit. As you recall and as evidenced by those who were there that night and in the log book you warned me that I could get myself into a lot of trouble if I continued to write up gas leaks and you refused to go out and look at the leak with me three times. You said I was playing games and that if I wanted to play games you would see who would last the longest. I took that as a direct threat and all I continued to do is convey to you that it was part of my job. The next time there was another leak going offsite you and other supervisors tried to turn the investigation of the leak into a write up for getting the truck stuck in the mud. I as well as all others have gotten the truck stuck in the mud numerous times including wrecks and even a supervisor who drove through the fence itself by forgetting to put it in park and never at any time were they considered to be incidences.

If someone feels I have disrespected anyone on this site I would like to know about it. I have been called names , I have been written about in formal meetings and I have been verbally and physically threatened infront of upper management and can prove this and no one has ever come to be and said (b) we are sorry you have been disrespected.

Again Respectfully,
(b) (7) (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

(b) (7)
(b) (7)(C), (b) (7) HO/DuPont
04/12/2012 02:57 PM

To (b) (7) (b) (7) CL/DuPont@DuPont
cc
bcc
Subject Re: Communication

(b) (7)

It is clear by this email that you do not have all the information or do not want to acknowledge that several important considerations listed in section B Job Vacancies section of the Burnside Policy Manual were not followed correctly and were given improperly will ill intent to those who self-nominated. These items are inconsistent with proper ethical Dupont Hiring and promotion standards for filling job vacancies and will be dealt with accordingly.

Respectfully,

(b) (7) (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (7) CL/DuPont

(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont
04/12/2012 02:24 PM



To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

cc

Subject Communication



There were some comments made in forward energy regarding the status of fulfilling the gap created by (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) retirement. It appears there is a significant amount misinformation circulating.

Here's the current status -

- The position was posted to DuPont employees
- Three DuPont employees self-nominated
- The process to fill the role was (1) complete a clerical skills assessment, (2) pass a computer skills test and (3) successfully interview with a hiring team
- One employee did not advance to the computer testing portion due to personnel policies
- Unfortunately, the other two employees were not able to progress through all three stages - Due to this reality, we have had to continue a temporary arrangement established upon (b) (7)(C), departure where the shipping task is being handled by a DuPont and contract employee
- The shipping clerk position has not been permanently filled
- Options are being reviewed so a path forward can be chosen that is in the best interest of the business, the team and all individuals

I hope this explanation will help minimize the distractions that have arisen so we can move forward and maintain a safe and healthy workplace.

As more information is available it will be communicated.

In the meantime, if you have a question please ask. It's the only way issues can be resolved before assumptions lead to improper reactions.



(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) /AE/DuPont

05/02/2012 04:58 PM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) HO/DuPont@DuPont

cc

bcc

Subject Hot Line Case 3114

Dear (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

I have reviewed your recent complaint in Hot Line Case 3114. I have sought input with regard to the process the Site followed to fill the Administrative Specialist position at the Burnside Site. It appears that you failed to pass the qualifications test for the position in question and were thus ineligible for the position. There was nothing unusual in either giving the exam or in the manner in which it was conducted. This does not appear to be a people treatment issue given these very straightforward facts. I am thus closing this case.

(b) (7)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Employee Engagement & Inclusion
D-6048- DuPont Building

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) usa.dupont.com

(b) (7)(C),
(b) (7)(C), (b) HO/DuPont
05/04/2012 05:56 PM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject Re: Hot Line Case 3114

(b) (7)(C),
[REDACTED]

With all due respect, the procedure they followed can be interpreted a couple different ways and because one of my co-workers (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) who took the test with me expressed to me that (b) spoke to the test administrator and told (b) (b) would not want the job because of the pay cut and that (b) convinced (b) to take it anyway that in fact they interpreted the policy the same as I did. I believe it states that in order to test qualified and software capable people for this job that two or more candidates would have to be qualified. There were not two or more candidates since I was the only one who met the criteria and I was the only one who said they wanted the job. We have never tested anyone of this site before this, period. It is well known of this site, that my capabilities in MS. Word, Excel and others are second to none on the site, otherwise I would not be asked to aid the office personell on a regular basis including the ladies who previously held the position and the contractor who they ended up giving the position to who was not given any test. I invite (b) (7) or anyone else to question anyone on the site outside of the current management to this fact. The test was supposed to be on software we have on the plant site. Currently we do not have the version of Excel or Word that the test covered on the plantsite. I was not given proper instructions for taking the test I was told it would be timed and it was not.. The scores of the test were not shared with either of us. I was not instructed physically on how to answer the test questions which were a little abnormal.

The contractor who was given the job was previously heard telling other co-workers that (b) (7)(C), (b) the adminstator of the test would be giving us a test we could not past so that (b) could get the job. (b) should be questioned by HR to whether this, in fact, is true. This was overheard by (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) who is willing to testify to this fact. (b) told it to (b) (7)(C), (b) (6). Also, you will find that I have since updated my case 3114 since they have now tried to write me up (two page write up) only everything they say in the write-up is completely false and can be proven and will be proven. Last week my site HR. Manager was visiting and I shared with (b) the fact that I had spoken to the Hotline and created the case number 3114, at that time (b) advised me that (b) knew nothing of any HR case that I had filed.

I asked to speak to (b) in private and we spoke for an hour and a half the evening of (b) visit and I explained my previous complaint about retaliation for bringing up discriminatory practices which is currently unsettled and told (b) all about my new complaint that the plant manager and (b) (7)(C), (b) retaliated against me for reporting Gas leaks on the site that (b) has been trying to cover up. In fact, (b) had previously came out to the site and threatened me by saying I could get myself in a lot of trouble for putting the gas leaks in writing and that (b) didn't care if I wrote it down and put it in my locker but I was not to put in the computer because it made a legal document. I expressed that I was doing my job no different than I had ever done and would continue that I am legally obligated to report any and all leaks to my supervisor.

So after having told (b) (7) that I had filed this complaint for retaliation I found out on Tuesday of this week that I was going to written up for several items all of which have been falsified and so I refused to sign it and asked to speak to (b) (7) again. I found out later that day when speaking to (b) (7) that in fact (b) had advised them on how and what to what type of "write up" they could send me as (b) called it a "note to folder". So after telling (b) (7) about my complaint with you guys were they have retaliated against me again, (b) proceeded to help them produce a "note to folder" that put me on notice that any further disruptions or deviations would get me put on probation and maybe even seperated from the company. (b) suggested that I write (b) with all the information in which I disagree with the two page "note to folder" and that (b) would discuss it with me afterwards which I fully intend to do later tonight when I have time. I will forward you a copy of that information if you like. You will find that I have updated my case 3114 to include this so at this time I would not like you to close it but to have someone come down to investigate

what has taken place. (b) (7)(C), (b) sat in as my witness to the entire events when I was given the so called "note to folder" by (b) (7)(C), (b) and (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

I am completely disheartened by the treatment I continue to receive at the hands of the company I have been a loyal and dependable worker for now for nearly 23 years. As I have stated before I have been continually harassed now by co-workers and management for over 3 years and been called names in meetings have been physically threatened with violence on two occasions, my marriage and my family's health has suffered as evidenced by our counseling visits marriage counseling and health reports and have only this week learned of a life-threatening illness my wife my have which is thought to be directly related to extreme stress conditions. We all, even my (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) has experienced sleep disorders over the hostile work environment and attitude that my current employer has shown me. I am in desperate need of Corporate Human Resource intervention.

Respectfully,

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

(b) (7)(C),
(b) (6) HO/DuPont
05/04/2012 07:12 PM

To (b) (7) B Pfalzgraf/CL/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C), M
(b) (7)(C), AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc
bcc
Subject May 1, 2012 Note to File

(b) (7)

Here is my perception, as you termed it, as we discussed via the phone May 1, 2012 where I was presented for the first time with a "Note to File" by (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) and (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) with (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) present as my witness taking notes. As you have discussed with me, you were involved directly with the instructions on how to construct and present a "Note to File". As you know I had only a week earlier contacted Corp. HR hotline complaining about the retaliatory action continuing toward me by management in regards to the administrative logistics shipping specialist job I had applied for. I also had informed you of the ongoing complaint # 2767 I have regarding retaliation by previous management when I came forward in defense of two of my co-workers who felt they were being discriminated against. I am deeply disturbed by this latest set of events where it seems even corp. HR may be involved in immediately retaliating against me by trying to falsify events against me only a week after my initial complaint. I am even on record with you (b) (7) stating to you that you should not be surprised that you might see my name come across your desk by my management trying to terminate me. You asked, "for what?" I stated, "I do not know but they will come up with something I am telling you". I told you how fearful and stressed out I have been.

Now only yesterday I found out that my wife was diagnosed with a potentially life threatening illness which is often attributed to extreme stressfulness. My family and I have been harassed, I have personally been threatened on two occasions and I have been called names in formal meetings and still DuPont does nothing but make me out to be the villain. I have done my job at DuPont now for almost 23 years I have done it successfully and I have done it properly in accordance with all the state and federal laws I do not deserve the treatment that DuPont has shown me during the last 3 years after my having come forward on behalf of my co-workers. I am still hopeful that DuPont will step up and do the right thing at some point.

The following items were reported to me on May 1, 2012 as behaviors not conducive to the site. I will address each one specifically since I disagree with each and everyone and want someone who is non-biased to investigate them so that this illegal behavior is not continued by this current Burnside management team.

1) April 12th 2012 Disruptive Behavior in Forward Energy Meeting.

False

I asked what this was about on (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) told me that immediately following the meeting a person approached (b) (7) and told (b) (7) that they thought I was disruptive during the meeting and that (b) (7) could not disclose to me who that person was, though I suspect it may be someone directly related to the allegations of retaliation that were presented during the meeting. At no time did I speak inappropriately or loudly but professionally and matter of factly.

The results of the forward energy meeting from the previous week and the April 12th week were both poor, the comments reflected the fact that people were disturbed by managements decision as it relates to the administrative job and evidently the recent hiring process. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) runs our forward energy meetings and asked if anyone wanted to respond as to why the energy was the way it was. I waited a moment to see if anyone wanted to speak first and then I stated, "yes, I will address that. I said that I was deeply disturbed with the manner in which the filling of (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) position was handled. I said I feel it was handled improperly and that it looked to me as though I was again being retaliated against. I said I would not discuss why I feel that way publically but I had already discussed much of it with (b) (7) on the phone when (b) (7) called to let me know I could not get the job. (b) (7) stepped in and said (b) (7) wanted to know why

the job filling process was being kept such a secret. (b) said (b) didn't think it was being kept a secret, I said I felt like (b) that it was absolutely being kept a secret much like everything else from management. I said then, that we have procedures in place for filling of a job out here and I did not understand why we simply couldn't follow them the same all the time. At the end of the meeting they asked to discuss with me what problems I had with the hiring procedure and I said I was really not interested in discussing it further that I was going to wait to discuss it with an independant party. As you know that is what I thought you (b) (7) were coming to do at the site. But much to my dismay you said you knew nothing of my HR. hotline complaint # 3114. So I discussed with you for 1 1/2 hours and filled in the blanks for you. I asked every person I could think of, besides (b) (7)(C), (b) and (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) if they thought I was disrespectful or disruptive in anyway during the April 12, 2012 Forward Energy Meeting and everyone I could remember being present said absolutely not that they agreed with me 100%. I would welcome an investigation into this matter.

2) Multiple emails involving threatening language

False

As you know (b) (7) I have forwarded you every email conversation I have had with (b) (7)(C), (b) and again I do not see where (b) finds any of them threatening unless (b) misunderstood where I stated in one that the appropriate action would be taken in regards to the retaliation I was experiencing. As I stated to you and (b) during the presentation of the "Note to File" that I was simply stated that my attorney was given the information and that appropriate legal action would be taken. As far as ,sending (b) (7)(C), (b) multiple emails I do not recall sending (b) (7)(C), (b) any emails that were not replies to (b) having sent me emails first. The one exception would be the email I sent on behalf of my co-worker (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) who had suggested to me that during (b) conversation with (b) (7)(C), (b) that (b) asked us all to speak on behalf of (b) (7)(C). if we knew any information about historical problems with our site contract electric group. Since I was working at night and would not be available to speak with (b) during the day I sent (b) an email on (b) (7)(C), (b) behalf.

3) (b) refused to agree on a time to meet/discuss with plant manager in regards to policy/procedures issues on the site.

False

As you now know, (b) (7) (b) is speaking about the three or four emails (b) sent me trying to get me to meet with (b) about what was done improperly by management in replacing (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) position. I stated to (b) after the forward energy meeting as well as in all the emails that I did not want to speak to (b) about this matter since I suspected (b) might be involved. (b) was in (b) (7)(C), (b) office when I got there and told (b) "here (b) comes" and immediately walked away hurriedly and after I finished the test I witnessed (b) immediately go into (b) office. In any case, I had already discussed the matter with corp. HR and was waiting for their advice on whether an investigation would be done as you were told by me (b) (7) during our initial meeting.

4) Line Management and (b) agreed to meet on 4/17/2012 at the scheduled time of 05:45 am as a follow-up from items discussed in forward energy meeting. (b) failed to show up for meeting without notification.

False

(b) (7)(C), initially contacted me the night before to ask me whether I wanted to discuss the hiring of the new person (b) (7)(C), (b). I asked (b) why I would want to do that. (b) said, because it seemed like there was a lot of comotion in the forward energy meeting about how (b) was hired. I said I had nothing to do with that, I was not on the hiring committee and have no way of knowing anything about (b) (7)(C), (b) being hired. I expressed to (b) that I like the young man very much, (b) seems very bright and would be a welcomed member of our team. I said that I had heard people talking about it though and suggested (b)

might want to speak to the members of the hiring committee. I expressed to (b) that my concern was that the filling of (b) (7)(C), (b) job was done improperly but I was now being advised not to speak to anyone about it without my attorney being present. My attorney had said that I have been through enough out here and that if anyone wanted to speak to me about illegal behavior that (b) would have to be present. After (b) (7)(C), kept asking me I did agree to meet with (b) since I had no reason to believe that (b) was involved in anyway and (b) was my first line supervisor. I had asked (b) to meet with me about a previous job filling that I felt was done improperly as well and (b) had agreed but never set a date to meet with me even though I had asked (b) twice.

So, we hung up, I thought, with the understanding that (b) was going to come in early to work and meet me at 05:15. I would have worked a 12 hour night shift and (b) asserted that (b) was going to take a physical and had to leave at 06:00 to be there at 07:00. As (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) will attest to I stayed over until 05:29 and then went to my car in the parking area where I waited another few minutes until probably 05:35 and (b) had not shown up. (b) allegation that I did not notify (b) is also false since I left word with (b) (7) Williams and the other two co-workers that I stayed past the time (b) had agreed on then left as evidenced by my hand logging out our palm system at about 05:29. This fact can be verified by (b) who maintains the palm reader. Perhaps this was just a misunderstanding, (b) (7)(C), called me later that morning about 06:15 to ask what had happened and I told (b) I had stayed until 05:29 and that (b) had never come in and (b) said then that (b) had told me 05:45 and I told (b) then I thought (b) had said quarter after 5 maybe (b) had said quarter to Six, I can not say. I expressed to (b) that it was not a big deal that we could reschedule, though I never heard back from (b) in any attempt to do so but I did hear back from (b). (b) (7)(C), (b) emailed me wanting to meet with me several times, however.

Another section implies that I fail to consistently follow the site reporting procedure:

5) Giving incomplete information: 4/22/12 (b) was assigned as the day board operator. It was written in the operator log book that there was a small gas leak on the converter. (b) failed to call to supervision or to initiate the first report.

False

Actually at 04:30 my outside co-worker (b) (7), (b) (7) was coming back from (b) last round around the plant when (b) called from (b) radio that (b) saw a small gas leak coming from the converter. (b) (7)(C), (b) was loading a truck and also thinks (b) heard the same report on (b) radio as well. When (b) (7) came through the door (b) stated plainly that there was a small leak on the converter and I stated at that point that I was going to log it into the Red Shift Log book which is for passing on information to the oncoming shift. Five or ten minutes later the shift relief was here to relieve us and I over heard (b) (7) telling (b) (7)(C), that there was a small gas leak on the converter not very big at all. I stated out loud that I had written it in the book. (b) (7)(C), has stated to me plainly that (b) recalls the whole conversation and that (b) did hear me say I wrote it in the red book. In any case, as prescribed to us in the control room on Tuesday of this week a leak that small doesn't need to be reported but just passed on to the next shift so that they can keep an eye on the leak, which is precisely what we did. We write these things in the book incase we forget what to tell the next shift and or incase they forget what we told them during the relief communication.

The log book is a critical communication tool that we as operators depend on gravely at this site. After getting three different reporting methods from (b) (7)(C), (b) on three different occasions (b) finally looked it up in the site Safety Manual and it seems that none of the methods we were using or were prescribed to use by (b) were what was written in the Safety Manual after all. I can forward a copy of that procedure to you if you like. In anycase, it has never been the duty of the control room board operator to report gas leaks that (b) has absolutely no idea of the severity or the direction. It is my job to log things in the book as outlined by my two outside operators. The three leaks I reported while working the outside job where also reported to my first line supervisor or (b) (7)(C), (b) by me personally as is my job duty while working the outside job but not the inside job and I do believe that (b) (7)(C), understands this now..

6) Expectations on proper follow up had just been reiterated to the site on April 11, 2012 and (b) received a verbal dated Feb. 1, 2012

False

I can only assume that (b) is still speaking about the (5) statement above where (b) actually came to work and threatened my job if I would write in a leak in the computer again I had sent (b) (7)(C), an email since we were previously unable to ever get (b) on the phone I had plans to call (b) (7) or (b) (7)(C), (b) if (b) had not gotten back to me in a few minutes. As I suggested to you we believe (b) didn't return our calls because (b) wasn't sure what to tell us to do. But when we emailed (b) (b) called us back immediately and asked us what we thought we should do because it was in writing. If you ask any operator they will tell you exactly the same thing. I was also advised, by my attorney, to put everything noteworthy in writing from now on so that it could no longer be denied like was the case with two verbal meetings I had with (b) (7)(C), (b).

Another section described as: FACTS OF OTHER PERFORMANCE ISSUES

Jan. 5 2012 Verbal Expectation on creating and maintaining a respectful work place.

7) Although I admit I was questioned in (b) (7) office regarding my email to (b) on behalf of Nathaniel, never did (b) verbally reprimand me for having done so. (b) merely stated that we can not interfere with investigations that we are not involved in, to which I totally agreed but expressed that I was explicitly asked to speak on behalf of (b) (7)(C), who said that (b) (7)(C), (b) was requesting it. Since we had previously spoken privately to (b) about these on going issues I had no reason to believe it was not truthful. Seems this can easily be explained by asking (b) (7)(C), (b) if (b) spoke to (b) (7)(C), about this and told (b) to get (b) co-workers to speak to (b) on (b) behalf. I can forward you the email I sent on behalf of (b) (7)(C), I, of historical events that took place with our KBR electric team and events that continue to happen that have been expressed to me by KBR African American employees that are clearly discriminatory.

I will be clear at no time have I been involved in spreading of rumors on this plant site I have discussed important issues related to safety, people treatment and respect with many of my co-workers as we all have a right to do. I have not interfered in anyway with any investigation that I was not directly involved in and when I was directly involved all I did was shared information that I had. I reject the premise that I am interfering with investigations at this site. In the email I shared with (b) prompted by (b) (7)(C), (b) I also shared the information about the discriminatory activity taking place within KBR which it was stated that DuPont will not attempt to manage personnel relations within a contract company. While I do not believe we should attempt to manage personnel relations within our onsite contract maintenance group I do believe we should expect them to follow the laws as laid out by the state of Louisiana and the Federal Government of the United States. In any case, it should have been given to KBR upper management for them to investigate. After all would we all stand by if a woman was been harassed, if not, then why should we stand by with men are being discriminated against and pretend that it is not our problem. They are both protected under the same EEOC laws of the Federal Government. I feel it is a moral obligation. I am sure there is something written in the contract between KBR and DuPont that would justify such a stance. The only point I was making in the email was that the very person that was speaking out against (b) (7)(C), in (b) matter was the very same person who tried to get me in trouble for riding the track mobile three years ago, I known friend of (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) and (b) own people feel (b) is discriminatory. A lot of people at this site fear management's reprisal from KBR and DuPont.

Feb. 1, 2012 Verbal Expectations on future reports of Safety or environmental concerns.

This is being brought up again and I am not sure what is being suggested here?

8) It is being suggested that somehow I encountered a safety or environmental issue that I couldn't not deal with or my team cannot deal with and that I need only call supervision.

This implication is false.

I have been working for DuPont now for 22 years and since (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) has been plant manager here I can assure you there has not been an environmental issue or safety issue that I have felt I could not handle and therefore needed to call my plant supervision. In fact, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) is trying to misrepresent the facts as they were stated to me that night. I am fully aware that when we get a leak on a vessel that we are to immediately reduce the rates of the plant in an attempt to lower the pressure on the vessel which will in turn lower the amount of the leak being set out into the atmosphere. If that procedure does not work it will then be my duty to shut the plant down, which is precisely what I told (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) when (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) called me that night and asked me what could be done. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) finally agreed with me and as I was about to start cutting back rates with my co-workers (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) showed up at the plant furious and threatened me. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) decided that the plant would not be shutdown and refused to go look at the leaks with me three times and once in front of my two co-workers which can easily be investigated.

In fact, it is my supervision, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) and even (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) who seemingly do not understand that we have not only an obligation to the community and the people working at the site to prevent or end these type leaks but a legal responsibility to the United States Government as per our permit to do so as well. What is most frustrating is that I found out later that the KBR group who left the leak had already contacted DuPont Supervision who okayed them to come back in the morning until which time scaffolding could be erected to better mitigate the leak and that at no time did anyone in KBR management or DuPont management think it advisable to communicate that to us. They didn't even think it necessary to communicate to the operators running the plant that they were leaving us with a huge leak. I could have assured them then that we needed to cut rates. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) questioned all of us about the events myself, and (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) and you can easily question (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) about it if you choose. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) will tell you the truth and what should have happened.

9) It was explained to me that Line management is concerned that I am distracted by previous events

True

This statement is absolutely true and I absolutely do not deny it. I am distracted by previous events as is my wife and the rest of my family even my parents are concerned. Because things have not gotten any better but actually much worse with the new management in place, (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) and (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) how can I be expected to not be distracted. Two of my co-workers have also expressed their concern to (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) both written and verbally as they feel they are being targeted as well. In fact, one of them has expressed to me that (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) has noticed increased surveillance not only by DuPont supervision but also KPR supervision as well, who are set on trying to get (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) in trouble. I have been utilizing the company EAP unit to help with my stress but the events that take place almost on a weekly basis at the site are incredibly hard to deal with emotionally.

10) Feb. 16, 2012 Verbal Customer Syngenta Received out of spec shipment, wrong grade of acid. It was described to me in Feb., as a non-event since the customer could not prove that the acid had come from the load I had shipped and that it was the third load that they had received by us that they were stating to be out of specs. I asked what my retained sample had shown and (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) told me then that someone had already dumped the shelf that my sample was on. So we really do not know what I loaded on the truck because my sample was poured away. Also one of my co-workers told me that (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) was going to be written up earlier for the same thing if it wasn't for (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) writing in the red book that the Paper work for the Syngenta system had been input incorrectly into SAP by corporate logistics so that it asks us to ship the wrong product to them which would explain why three loads were supposedly sent incorrectly to them. This is written in the 2011 log book which is now missing. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) had told that individual to load the product that is in SAP and the truck driver was telling the operator that it would be the wrong product. But (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) told (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) to load it anyway. It ended up being the wrong product and the supervisor tried to get (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) in trouble about it until (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) showed (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) in the Red Book where (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) had written that (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) had told (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) to load it anyway. Needless to say, no mention was ever made of it again.

In any case, I asked on May 1st when this was brought to me in this "note to file" document if the person that had it happen to them twice before me was also receiving a "note to file" and they said that it is confidential information although when I asked the person who admitted (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) was the one who had done it,

I respectfully disagree with each and every incidence of noted as a performance issue in this "note to file" document and implicitly express that it is , in fact, a complete fabrication by (b) (7)(C), and (b) (7)

I have no problems with the expectations to be met and have never had problems with them.

Respectfully,

(b) (7) (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)
Operations Team



(b) (7)(C), (b) /AE/DuPont

05/18/2012 04:37 PM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) HO/DuPont@DuPont

cc (b) (7) (b) /CL/DuPont@DuPont

bcc

Subject Re: Hot Line Case 3114

Dear (b) (7)

Thank you for the additional information. However, it does not appear that you have raised any issues that are significantly different than the ones we have already investigated. We believe that these issues have been appropriately addressed.

(b) (7)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Employee Engagement & Inclusion
D-6048- DuPont Building

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) usa.dupont.com

(b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) 05/04/2012 06:56:57 PM--(b) (7)(C), (b) (6), With all due respect, the procedure they fol...

From: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) HO/DuPont

To: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) AE/DuPont@DuPont

Cc: (b) (7) (b) /CL/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7) (b) /CL/DuPont@DuPont

Date: 05/04/2012 06:56 PM

Subject: Re: Hot Line Case 3114

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

With all due respect, the procedure they followed can be interpreted a couple different ways and because one of my co-workers (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) who took the test with me expressed to me that (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) spoke to the test administrator and told (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) would not want the job because of the pay cut and that (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) convinced (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) to take it anyway that in fact they interpreted the policy the same as I did. I believe it states that in order to test qualified and software capable people for this job that two or more candidates would have to be qualified. There were not two or more candidates since I was the only one who met the criteria and I was the only one who said they wanted the job. We have never tested anyone of this site before this, period. It is well known of this site, that my capabilities in MS. Word, Excel and others are second to none on the site, otherwise I would not be asked to aid the office personell on a regular basis including the ladies who previously held the position and the contractor who they ended up giving the position to who was not given any test. I invite (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) or anyone else to question anyone on the site outside of the current management to this fact. The test was supposed to be on software we have on the plant site. Currently we do not have the version of Excel or Word that the test covered on the plantsite. I was not given proper instructions for taking the test I was told it would be timed and it was not.. The scores of the test were not shared with either of us. I was not instructed physically on how to answer the test questions which were a little abnormal.

The contractor who was given the job was previously heard telling other co-workers that (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) the adminstator of the test would be giving us a test we could not past so that (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) could get the job. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) should be questioned by HR to whether this, in fact, is true. This was overheard by (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) who is willing to testify to this fact. (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) told it to (b) (7)(C), (b) (6). Also, you will find that I have since updated my case 3114 since they have now tried to write me up (two page write up) only everything they say in the write-up is completely false and can be proven and will be proven. Last week my site HR. Manager was visiting and I shared with (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) the fact that I had spoken to the Hotline and created the case number 3114, at that time (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) advised me that (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) knew nothing of any HR case that I had filed.

I asked to speak to (b) in private and we spoke for an hour and a half the evening of (b) visit and I explained my previous complaint about retaliation for bringing up discriminatory practices which is currently unsettled and told (b) all about my new complaint that the plant manager and (b) (7)(C), (b) retaliated against me for reporting Gas leaks on the site that (b) has been trying to cover up. In fact, (b) had previously came out to the site and threatened me by saying I could get myself in a lot of trouble for putting the gas leaks in writing and that (b) didn't care if I wrote it down and put it in my locker but I was not to put in the computer because it made a legal document. I expressed that I was doing my job no different than I had ever done and would continue that I am legally obligated to report any and all leaks to my supervisor.

So after having told (b) (7) that I had filed this complaint for retaliation I found out on Tuesday of this week that I was going to be written up for several items all of which have been falsified and so I refused to sign it and asked to speak to (b) (7) again. I found out later that day when speaking to (b) (7) that in fact (b) had advised them on how and what type of "write up" they could send me as (b) called it a "note to folder". So after telling (b) (7) about my complaint with you guys were they have retaliated against me again, (b) proceeded to help them produce a "note to folder" that put me on notice that any further disruptions or deviations would get me put on probation and maybe even separated from the company. (b) suggested that I write (b) with all the information in which I disagree with the two page "note to folder" and that (b) would discuss it with me afterwards which I fully intend to do later tonight when I have time. I will forward you a copy of that information if you like. You will find that I have updated my case 3114 to include this so at this time I would not like you to close it but to have someone come down to investigate what has taken place. (b) (7)(C), (b) sat in as my witness to the entire events when I was given the so called "note to folder" by (b) (7)(C), (b) and (b) (7)(C), (b) (6).

I am completely disheartened by the treatment I continue to receive at the hands of the company I have been a loyal and dependable worker for now for nearly 23 years. As I have stated before I have been continually harassed now by co-workers and management for over 3 years and been called names in meetings have been physically threatened with violence on two occasions, my marriage and my family's health has suffered as evidenced by our counseling visits marriage counseling and health reports and have only this week learned of a life-threatening illness my wife has which is thought to be directly related to extreme stress conditions. We all, even my (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) has experienced sleep disorders over the hostile work environment and attitude that my current employer has shown me. I am in desperate need of Corporate Human Resource intervention.

Respectfully,

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)



(b) (7) (b) (7) /CL/DuPont

03/29/2012 12:59 PM

To (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) (b) (7)(C), /AE/DuPont@DuPont

cc (b) (7)(C), (b) /AP/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)
(b) (7)(C), AE/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C),

bcc (b) (7)(C), /HO/DuPont@DuPont, (b) (7)(C), (b)

Subject Re: First Reports

All,

Seven incidents in a little over a week is way above normal.

Fortunately, we have been able to maintain the first item in the Top 5 - Protect Yourself, Your Coworkers and The Environment.

Remember, maintaining excellent safety performance requires constant vigilance to the states which prevent critical errors.

Thanks for your help in keeping Burnside a safe place to work.

Best Regards,

(b) (7)(C), (b)

Burnside Plant

DUCOM (b) (7)(C),

(b) (6)

Cell: (b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

DuPont Chemicals & Fluoroproducts

Wilmington, Delaware

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) --03/29/2012 12:48:46 PM-- (b) (7)(C), (b) (6) Dupont Chemical Solutions Enterprises




From:





To:

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

Date: 03/29/2012 12:48 PM

Subject: First Reports

 Entergy
voltage drop 3.23.2012.doc
 CIP gas leak loading
3.18.2012.doc
 SO3 in
control
panel at
crack.doc

 Burnside First Report -Elec. Junction Box.doc
 Railcar
cap not
in
place.doc
 Cip Gas
Leak
3.19.2012.doc
 Derail
at 5,7
crack.doc

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6)

*Dupont Chemical Solutions Enterprises
Burnside Plant*

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) Tel

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) fax

(b) (7)(C), (Ducom)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (6) @usa.dupont.com